REMARKS

Please reconsider this application in view of the above amendments and the following remarks. Applicants thank the Examiner for carefully considering the application and for the courtesies extended during the Examiner Interview of June 11, 2009.

Disposition of Claims

Claims 1, 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 19, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 31, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39-41 were pending in the present application. By way of this submission, claims 3, 4, 7, 9, 10, 15, 16, 21, 22, 25, 27, 28, 33, 36, 39-41 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Also by way of this submission, claims 42 and 43 are added. Accordingly, claims 1, 13, 19, 31, 34, 37, 42, and 43 are now pending in the present application. Claims 1, 13, 19, 31, 34, and 37 are independent. The remaining claims depend from claims 1 and 19.

Claim Amendments

By way of this submission, independent claims 1, 13, 19, 31, 34, and 37 are amended for clarification. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter is introduced by way of these amendments, as support for these amendments may be found, for example, on pages 14 and 15 of the originally filed specification, in Figure 1 and Figure 2, and in the originally filed claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 7, 13, 25, 31, 34, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the document entitled: "pwdump – Windows NT password hash retrieval"

(hereinafter "Allison") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,592,553 (hereinafter "Guski"). By way of this submission, claims 7 and 25 are cancelled and thus rejection is moot as to those claims. As for the remaining rejected claims, to the extent that the rejection still applies to the claims as amended, this rejection is respectfully traversed for the reason set forth below.

MPEP § 2143 states that "the key to supporting any rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 is the clear articulation of the reason(s) why the claimed invention would have been obvious. The Supreme Court in KSR noted that the analysis supporting a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103 should be made explicit." Further, when combining prior art elements, the Examiner "must articulate the following: (1) a finding that the prior art included each element claimed, although not necessarily in a single prior art reference, with the only difference between the claimed invention and the prior art being the lack of actual combination of the elements in a single prior art reference…" *See* MPEP § 2143(A). Applicants respectfully assert that the Examiner has failed to do so.

If the Examiner does not produce a *prima facie* case, Applicants are under no obligation to submit evidence of non-obviousness. The initial evaluation of *prima facie* obviousness thus relieves both the Examiner and the Applicants from evaluating evidence beyond the prior art and the evidence in the specification as filed until the art has been shown to suggest the claimed invention. *See* MPEP § 2142.

The Examiner admits that Allison fails to teach or suggest obtaining a temporary user name based on a user name. Instead, the Examiner relies on Guski to teach or suggest what Allison lacks. In other words, the Examiner contends that Guski teaches obtaining a temporary user name based on a user name. *See, e.g.,* Action at pages 9 and 10.

Guski teaches the existence of "one-time" or "dynamic" passwords that are only valid for a brief window of time. *See* Guski at column 1, lines 40-45. However, during this window of time, users in possession of Guski's "temporary" passwords have full access to all data and functions. In other words, users in possession of Guski's "temporary" passwords are neither restricted to a subset of the total data nor restricted to a subset of all functions. The only restriction that accompanies Guski's "temporary" passwords is the window of time during which the passwords must be used. User authentication will fail if Guski's "temporary" passwords are used outside of this window of time. *See* Guski at column 1, lines 39-67 and at column 2, lines 1-9. Accordingly, Guski fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein the user name has access to a set of data and functions in the database, wherein the temporary user name is restricted to a subset of the set of data and functions, and wherein the subset has less data and fewer functions than the set," as recited by amended independent claims 1, 13, 31, 34, and 37.

Further, as discussed above, Guski teaches user authentication using time dependent passwords. *See, e.g.,* Guski at Abstract. Allison teaches a utility that dumps the password database of an NT machine. *See* Allison at page 1. However, neither Guski nor Allison teach or suggest at least, "wherein the user logs in to the software application using a user name and a user password, wherein the software application signs on to the database using the user name and a database password, and wherein the database password comprises a hash of the user name and the user password," as recited by amended independent claim 1. Amended independent claims 13, 31, 34, and 37 recite similar limitations. Accordingly, Allison and Guski, whether viewed separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended independent claims 1, 13, 31, 34, and 37.

13

In view of the above, the Examiner's contentions and the cited prior art references do not support a rejection of amended independent claims 1, 13, 31, 34, and 37. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Allison, in view of Guski, and in further view of U.S. Patent 5,734,718 (hereinafter "Prafullchandra"). For the reasons set forth below, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner admits that Allison fails to teach or suggest obtaining a temporary user name based on a user name. Instead, the Examiner relies on Guski to teach or suggest what Allison lacks. In other words, the Examiner contends that Guski teaches obtaining a temporary user name based on a user name. *See, e.g.,* Action at pages 22 and 23.

As discussed above, Guski teaches the existence of "one-time" or "dynamic" passwords that are only valid for a brief window of time. *See* Guski at column 1, lines 40-45. However, during this window of time, users in possession of Guski's "temporary" passwords have full access to all data and functions. Accordingly, as also discussed above, Guski fails to teach or suggest at least "wherein the user name has access to a set of data and functions in the database, wherein the temporary user name is restricted to a subset of the set of data and functions, and wherein the subset has less data and fewer functions than the set," as recited by amended independent claim 19.

Further, as discussed above, Guski teaches user authentication using time dependent (*i.e.,* "temporary") passwords. *See, e.g.,* Guski at Abstract. Allison teaches a utility that dumps the password database of an NT machine. *See* Allison at page 1. The Examiner contends that

Prafullchandra teaches "wherein the launcher application is an embedded mechanism within the database." *See* Action at page 22. However, Guski, Allison, and Prafullchandra fail to teach or suggest at least, "wherein the user logs in to the software application using a user name and a user password, wherein the software application signs on to the database using the user name and a database password, and wherein the database password comprises a hash of the user name and the user password" as recited by amended independent claim 19. Accordingly, Allison, Guski, and Prafullchandra, whether viewed separately or in combination, do not teach or suggest each and every limitation of amended independent claim 19.

In view of the above, the Examiner's contentions and the cited prior art references do not support a rejection of amended independent claim 19. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 27, 28, 33, 36, and 39 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Allison, in view of Guski, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,418,854 (hereinafter "Kaufman"). By way of this submission, claims 3, 4, 9, 10, 15, 16, 27, 28, 33, 36, and 39 are cancelled, and thus the rejection is moot as to those claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Claims 21, 22, 40, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Allison, in view of Guski, in view of Prafullchandra, and in further view of Kaufman. By way of this submission, claims 21, 22, 40, and 41 are cancelled, and thus the rejection is moot as to those claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

New Claims

By way of this submission, new claims 42 and 43 are added. Applicants respectfully assert that no new matter is introduced by way of these additions as support for these additions may be found, for example, on pages 14 and 15 of the originally filed specification, in Figure 1 and Figure 2, and in the originally filed claims.

As discussed above, the Examiner's contentions and the cited prior art references do not support a rejection of independent claims 1 and 19. Claims 42 and 43 depend directly from independent claims 1 and 19. Accordingly, the cited prior art references also do not support a rejection of claims 42 and 43. Thus claims 42 and 43 are patentable.

Conclusion

Applicants believe this submission is fully responsive to all outstanding issues and places this application in condition for allowance. If this belief is incorrect, or other issues arise, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned or his associates at the telephone number listed below. Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account 50-0591 (Reference Number 37202/136001).

Dated: June 25, 2009   Respectfully submitted,

                      By   /Robert P. Lord/
                           Robert P. Lord
                           Registration No.: 46,479
                           OSHA · LIANG LLP
                           3945 Freedom Circle, Suite 300
                           Santa Clara, California 95054
                           (408) 727-0600
                           (408) 727-8778 (Fax)
                           Attorney for Applicants

542481_1